DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 117 FL 007 635

TITLE A Position Paper on Bilingual Education.
INSTITUTION Arizona Association of Mexican American Educators. Tucson Chapter.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Bilingualism; Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Policy; Language Programs; *Mexican Americans; Non English Speaking; *Program Design; *Spanish; Spanish Speaking

ABSTRACT

This position paper on bilingual education holds that the best way to meet the educational needs of non-English-speaking children in the United States is through bilingual education, that is, the use of the child's home language and culture in conjunction with English throughout his education. In view of this, the aims of the paper are to: (1) evaluate past practices and methods in light of recent educational and legislative developments, and (2) make recommendations for a comprehensive bilingual education program. A brief historical background of developments on the area of bilingual education is provided, and factors confirming the need for such programs are listed, including the percentage of the population that is Spanish-speaking, and the need for language skills for participation in society, conceptual development, and the development of one's self-image. The basic components needed to develop and implement a bilingual program involve community participation, administration, staff and staff development, materials, finances, and evaluation. (CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED121117

ARIZONA ASSOCIATION OF MEXICAN AMERICAN EDUCATORS

TUCSON CHAPTER

presents

A POSITION PAPER ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Revised

Spring 1975

FL007635

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Arizona Association of Mexican-American Educators
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

EDUCACION BILINGUE -- NUESTRA PERSPECTIVA

A POSITION PAPER ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION
BY THE TUCSON CHAPTER OF ARIZONA ASSOCIATION OF MEXICAN AMERICAN EDUCATORS

Revised Spring 1975

OFFICERS 1975

PRESIDENT	CARLOS NAVA
VICE PRESIDENT	FRANK HOWE
RECORDING SECRETARY	PATRICIA FLORES
CORRESPONDING SECRETARY	AMELIA BASURTO
TREASURER	REYNALDO OLEA

BILINGUAL POSITION PAPER COMMITTEE

ARMINDA FUENTEVILLA, CHAIRMAN	EDWARD MADRID
EUGENE BENTON	HENRY OYAMA
ERNESTO FIMBRES	ESTANISLADO PAZ
JAMES FISHER	DR. MACARIO SALDATE
ADALBERTO GUERRERO	

CONTENT

ARIZONA ASSOCIATES OF MEXICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION - OFFICERS

FOREWORD

I HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

II WHY IS BILINGUAL EDUCATION NEEDED?

III WHAT IS BILINGUAL EDUCATION?

IV WHAT BILINGUAL EDUCATION IS NOT

V WHAT ARE THE BASIC COMPONENTS NEEDED TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A BILINGUAL PROGRAM?

POSTSCRIPT

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A.A.M.A.E. MEMBERS WITH EXPERTISE IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

REPORTS OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION STUDY BY THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The extermination of a language, of a culture, and of a people, are all one and the same thing...

Naert, Pierre, and Halldor Halldorsson, et al, Revue Psychologie Des Peuples: XVII (1962), p. 355.

EDUCACION BILINGUE -- NUESTRA PERSPECTIVA

A position paper on bilingual education
by the Tucson Chapter of the Arizona
Association of Mexican American Educators

FOREWORD

Promoting quality education for Mexican Americans is the primary aim of the Tucson Chapter of the Arizona Association of Mexican American Educators (AAMAE). To further this aim, we shall evaluate past practices and methods in light of recent educational and legislative developments, particularly since the enactment of the "Bilingual Education Act"(Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1968). We also will make recommendations for a comprehensive bilingual education program.

The "Bilingual Education Act of 1968" created a national commitment for significant changes in the educational policies of school districts toward non-English-speaking students. It reversed a fifty-year-old "one language" policy by pledging the moral and legislative forces of the national government to help meet the educational needs of the large number of children of non-English-speaking ability in the United States.

We believe these needs can best be met through bilingual education -- an approach which constructively utilizes the child's home culture and language throughout his education.

We contend that efforts to educate Mexican Americans too often have viewed their linguistic and cultural attributes as inadequate and deficient simply because they are "incompatible" with an education system in English. The child's home culture has been viewed as an educational obstacle to be overcome in the transition to the English-speaking classroom. In the process, cultural and practical concepts he has learned in his home language have been shunted aside by this refusal to acknowledge his participation in the Spanish-speaking culture.

Programs based on these faulty pedagogical conceptions have passed for bilingual education. In effect, however, they have been remedial and they have failed. The statistics are clear. The median educational level of the Mexican American child is two years below that of his Anglo counterpart. His educational dropout rate is disproportionately higher.

One type of remedial program segregated Mexican American children in special English classes until they had overcome their language "handicap"

and thus had become "adjusted." This kind of spatial segregation has been ruled unconstitutional in two state court cases, one in Texas and one in California.[1]

Another approach, one used in Tucson's District #1, is the "1-C" program. The child spends one year with other Spanish-speaking children learning English and developing reading readiness. The following year he enters first grade and continues his educational career in English, a full year behind his English-speaking peers in both age and regular curriculum.

The most recent way of dealing with bilingual "problems" has been compensatory educational programs designed to alleviate the child's academic deficiencies. These are the very deficiencies caused by the requirement that he use English as his language of instruction.

We believe that these kinds of programs are worthwhile supplements to a bilingual program but that they cannot adequately fulfill the educational needs of the Mexican American. The distinctive culture of the Mexican American must be reflected in the content of his education. This is why we feel that bilingual-bicultural education is one of the best processes so far devised to enable the Spanish-speaking child to compete academically with his Anglo counterpart. We also believe it will help solve some of America's social and economic problems where cultural understanding between ethnic groups is lacking.

---

1 Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Independent School District, Civ. No. 68-C-95 (D.C. S.D.) Tex. Corpus Christi Div. (1970).
Mendez v. Westminister School District of Orange County, 64 F. Supp. 544, affirmed 161 F. 2d 774 (9th Cir. 1947).

I HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The concept of bilingual education is not a recent development. It has existed for centuries in many countries all over the world. Whenever and wherever two or more language groups have come together a strong need for each to learn the language of the other has arisen.

Bilingual education exists in countries like Canada and the Netherlands where many people speak a second language. In tri-lingual Switzerland (where 74 per cent of the people speak German; 24 per cent, French; and 4 per cent, Italian) the tax-supported schools use all three languages as mediums of instruction. The Soviet Union, with the world's largest and most successful bilingual system, has attributed the rapid spread of literacy to the use of local vernaculars. China, in spite of its standard written language through which its many language groups can communicate, also has implemented multilingual programs.

The history of bilingual education in the United States began shortly after the turn of the 19th century. In the Midwest, many schools had German-English bilingual education programs prior to World War I. An 1839 Ohio law stipulated that:

> In any district where the directors keep an English school and do not have branches taught in German, it shall be lawful for youths in such districts who desire to learn German language to attend a district German school.

This provision, only permissive for the state at large, became mandatory for Cincinnati through an 1840 law amending the city charter:

> It shall be the duty of the Board of Trustees...to provide a number of German schools for the instruction of such youth as desire to learn the German language or the German and English language together.[2]

Americans of Asian, Jewish, and Polish descent also have benefited from educational programs in which their mother tongue was used as a medium of instruction.

Shortly before World War I a spirit of isolationism and nationalism almost imperceptibly became part of our national philosophy and led to the view that different cultures and languages posed a threat to our country. As a result, the use of languages other than English

---

2 The Center Forum. Center for Urban Education, Vol. 4, No. 1, New York, September, 1969.

as mediums of instruction in our schools became almost nonexistent.

In recent years there again has emerged a struggle to legitimize bilingual education as a right and a necessity for non-English-speaking children. Advocates of this principle believe that ethnic minorities should have the freedom to maintain and develop their own cultural heritage in a pluralistic egalitarian society. In their attempts to adopt bilingual education, they have brought increasing pressure on legislators at city, state, and national levels.

Their struggle gained momentum in 1960 when one analysis[3] dismally revealed that in the five Southwestern states Mexican Americans had completed an average of 7.1 years in school compared to 12.1 for Anglos.

Here in Tucson, some educators already had perceived the urgent need for a more adequate approach to teaching Mexican Americans. They had seen even the latest linguistic teaching method -- give the student oral competence in a foreign language -- fail with native Spanish speakers at Pueblo High School. The school responded in 1959 by offering special Spanish classes for native speakers in which the teaching of Spanish culture was infused into the language instruction. One unexpected but extremely encouraging outcome of the program was that students in these classes demonstrated a strong and positive self-image directly linked to improved performance in other subject areas.

A memorable landmark to extensive use of the mother tongue and culture in Spanish-English bilingual education came in 1963 when Dade County (Miami), Florida, adopted this method to serve the educational needs of some 20,000 United States refugees of Cuban descent.

Two years later a comprehensive NEA-Tucson survey on special programs available for Spanish-speaking children in the Southwest was recommended by Tucsonian Maria Urquides, a dedicated and tireless advocate of the need for changes in the educational approach to Mexican Americans, and Monroe Sweetland, the NEA West Coast legislative consultant. The published report of the resulting survey by six Tucson educators, entitled "The Invisible Minority,"[4] forcefully stated the problems of the non-English-speaking child in the monolingual school. These problems were considered further at an NEA-sponsored symposium in Tucson in October, 1966. Anglo and Spanish-speaking educators from the entire Southwest

---

3 ibid.

4 "The Invisible Minority," Report of the NEA-Tucson survey on the teaching of Spanish to the Spanish-speaking. Washington, D.C.: NEA, Department of Rural Education, 1966.

made strong recommendations for bilingual education.

Former Texas Senator Ralph Yarbarough credits the findings of "The Invisible Minority" and the recommendations of the Tucson Symposium with motivating him to introduce a bill in the U.S. Senate which led to the momentous "Bilingual Education Act of 1968."

This act was the first major Congressional response to the dire needs of Mexican Americans and to other non-English-speaking students. It serves both as a statement of commitment to remedy the effects of educational discrimination suffered by generations of non-English-speaking children and as a necessary catalyst in a continuing challenge to traditional educational policies and practices. In supporting the act, Congress found:

> ...that one of the most acute educational problems in the United States is, that which involves millions of children of limited English-speaking ability because they come from environments where the dominant language is other than English...and that the urgent need is for comprehensive and cooperative action now on the local, state, and federal levels to develop forward-looking approaches to meet the serious learning difficulties faced by this substantial segment of the nation's school-age population.[5]

This act and its subsequent amendments provide for locally implemented programs of bilingual education to include the history and culture associated with the child's native language, closer cooperation between the school and the home, pre-school preparation, adult education, vocational training, and programs for actual or potential dropouts. Appropriations for these programs have expanded from $7.5 million in 1968 to $85 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. Aside from these increases in appropriations, amendments have expanded the scope of the act's treatment of the problem and, in doing so, have moved its emphasis from the demonstration stage to actual national policy and practice.

The expanded scope of bilingual education under more recent amendments is augmented in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.[6] The law provides, for individuals of limited English-speaking ability:

---

5 20 U.S.C. 880b.

6 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973. U.S. Code Congressional and Administrative News, 93rd Congress, 1st session, 1973, Vol. 1, p.925

> ...the teaching of occupational skills in the primary language of such persons for occupations which do not require a high proficiency in English...developing new employment opportunities for limited English-speaking persons and opportunities for promotion within existing employment situations for such persons, including programs for the dissemination of appropriate information, job placement and counseling assistance, and the conduct of training and employment programs, in the primary language of such persons, as well as programs designed to increase the English-speaking ability of such persons.

The strong language of a recent Supreme Court decision (Lau v. Nichols)7 has broadened the national impact of this legislation. In a 9-0 decision, the Court ruled that merely providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum does not constitute equal treatment. The Court reasoned that linguistic and cultural differences of students who do not understand English should not remain handicaps to their educational development.

States, too, now are accepting the need for bilingual educational programs. For example, in 1972, Massachusetts passed the nation's first comprehensive state bilingual education law. The statute notes that public educational instruction solely in English is inadequate for children with a different native tongue and that bilingual education therefore is necessary to ensure equal educational opportunity for every child. The Massachusetts law calls for the use of both a child's native tongue and English as mediums of instruction. It also requires the curriculum to include the history and culture associated with the child's native language.

The Bilingual Act of Alaska declares that the "right to one's native language and culture is inherent in the concepts underlying our constitutional guarantees" and that the absence of bilingual programs has created a great learning handicap for those to whom English is a second language. The act also notes:

> It is a well known fact that contrary traditional methods have resulted in below-standard achievements by Alaskan native students which, in turn, spawn difficulties in secondary and higher educational pursuits, exacerbate acculturation problems, present significant barriers in securing adequate employment and constitute a serious hindrance to the full enjoyment of life and its benefits.

Other states, notably Texas, Illinois, New Mexico, and California, have enacted or are initiating similar legislation.

---

7 Lau vs. Nichols, 94 S. Ct. 786 (1974) Supreme Court Reporter, Vol. 94, Feb. 15, 1974, Number 8, West Publishing Co.

The following statements are the basic views of the Tucson Chapter of the American Association of Mexican American Educators toward bilingual education.

II WHY IS BILINGUAL EDUCATION NEEDED?

Historically, the adverse social and economic conditions under which Mexican Americans have lived have seriously hindered their full participation in American society and the pursuit of the full range of life styles available to other Americans.

Until a few years ago, little was done to help the Mexican American progress educationally through use of his native tongue or even to encourage retention of his bilingualism. Those programs which professed to aid him met with only limited success in practice.

The following factors confirm the need for implementation of bilingual education programs:

1. Spanish is spoken by 260 million people, making it the third most widely spoken language in the world. By the year 2000 the number is expected to reach 400 million.

   The United States ranks fifth among all nations in its Spanish-speaking population. These Spanish speakers are particularly visible in the Southwest. In California, for instance, the Mexican American population is greater than the population of each of 28 states and 53 foreign countries. However, only the State of New Mexico has given Spanish coequal, official status with English. In most states, instruction in English, and only English, is mandatory.

2. Mexican Americans comprise 17 per cent of the population of Arizona, 17 per cent of Pima County, and 25 per cent of the city of Tucson. They comprise 28 per cent of the school population in Tucson's School District #1, the largest one in the state. The Spanish surnamed population here in Arizona increased 73.5 per cent between 1960 and 1970 according to figures from the 1970 U.S. Census. The need for bilingual education already is critical and as the size of Arizona's Mexican American population continues to increase, we see this need continuing.

3. Mexican Americans, and indeed all Americans, will benefit more from a pluralistic approach to education than from the continuation of

the "melting pot" concept with its inherent loss of divergent cultural and linguistic traits. Cultural and linguistic pluralism as envisioned here will not preclude participation by Mexican Americans in the dominant language and culture, or detract from their value as loyal and active citizens.

4. Facility in two languages puts the Mexican American child in a more competitive position in American society. Business, government, and other employers can best serve the public if they have trained bilingual personnel. Professional and vocational skills must be developed through programs at the high school and college levels that have been designed to meet these community employment needs.

5. Spanish-speaking U.S. citizens can be a valuable resource in establishing more harmonious relationships between the United States and the nations of Latin America which are emerging as a combined political and economic force of global significance. To ensure that this valuable linguistic and cultural resource is nutured, sustained, and preserved, bilingual-bicultural educational programs must be available to Spanish-speaking youth.

6. Speaking and developing one's native tongue enhances an individual's self-image and creates a stronger mutually reinforcing relationship between home and school. This in turn leads to better social and personal adjustment, enabling greater participation in the dominant society.

7. Language is the most important manifestation of the human personality. Most of us are unaware of its subtleties of meaning and how these reflect environment and culture. More importantly, the small child is completely unaware of his language as something outside himself. Thus a school's rejection of the child's mother tongue can adversely affect his concept of himself, his home, and his parents.

8. Conceptional development which begins early in life should not be thwarted or delayed until the English language is acquired simply because schools use a language different from the child's native tongue. Rather than being an obstacle to success in school, the child's Spanish language should be an effective tool for learning. Bilingual-bicultural education means the opportunity to learn educational concepts in all phases of the curriculum in the mother tongue while acquiring a knowledge of English. This prevents educational retardation while reinforcing the native tongue.

The importance of learning concepts and reading in the child's native language was recognized as early as 1951 when a report was presented on the use of vernacular language in education at a UNESCO meeting of linguistic specialists. The report supported the pedagogical soundness of teaching young children basic subjects in their own language. This has been further substantiated by other studies throughout the world, in the United States, and particularly in our Southwest.

III WHAT IS BILINGUAL EDUCATION?

1. Bilingual education is the process by which a selection of educational objectives are taught in two languages. These two languages, acting as mediums of instruction, are (1) the child's dominant or first language, and (2) a second language, acquired within or without school, but learned over the course of the child's complete education. The two languages under discussion herein are Spanish, as the native language, and English, as the second language.

2. Bilingual education demands that the instructional process also be bicultural. The cultural environment spawns, nutures, and gives the language its living character. The two are inseparable.

3. Bilingual education must be based on a "maintenance" approach rather than the now outdated "transitional" approach. "Maintenance" means that the child's dominant language and culture should be consciously nutured while he concurrently acquires proficiency in the second language and culture. His mother tongue should not be considered as merely a transitory vehicle to be shunted aside in an attempt to "assimilate" him into the dominant culture.

   The "maintenance" program must begin at the pre-school level and be continued through higher education. Quality courses and activities in Spanish must be incorporated as equal partners with their English language counterparts in such areas as literature, social science, and Spanish for native speakers.

IV WHAT BILINGUAL EDUCATION IS NOT

1. English as a Second Language (ESL) is a component of a bilingual program which cannot in itself be considered bilingual education. ESL focuses on English and diminishes or eliminates the learning of the home language.

2. The Foreign Language in the Elementary School program (FLES, also known as SSL, Spanish as a Second Language) is not of sufficient scope to be considered bilingual education. FLES is a program of teaching a foreign or a second language to children in the elementary years. It does not encompass the teaching of concepts in two languages.

3. Bilingual education is not compensatory education. The latter implies a remedial "catch-up" program to overcome academic deficiencies and/or difficulties incurred before or after the child has entered school.

4. The "bridging concept," a transitional instructional approach, is not bilingual education. This approach uses the native language solely as a bridge to the acquisition of English.

5. These four approaches can be considered supplementary facets of a comprehensive bilingual-bicultural program. But they cannot be considered a substitute. They misleadingly relegate the native language and culture to secondary importance by stressing (1) the acquisition of English in order to continue education only in English, and (2) the acquisition of skills lost in the process of educating the child in his second language.

Bilingual education stands on its own merits as a standard, initial educational program which must be woven into the entire educational curriculum.

V WHAT ARE THE BASIC COMPONENTS NEEDED TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A BILINGUAL PROGRAM?

Perhaps more critically than with any other type of educational enterprise, administrative and pedagogical decisions and procedures in bilingual education need to be based on a sound understanding of the linguistic, social, psychological, and cultural factors affecting students. The educational considerations which take all of these factors into account include the following components:

A. Community Involvement
B. Administration
C. Staff and Staff Development
D. Materials
E. Finances
F. Evaluation

A. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Parents and the community should understand and approve of the goals, reasons, and philosophy for a bilingual program. They should be involved in the program before, during, and after it has been initiated. A viable bilingual program must be based on a thorough needs assessment analysis of the social, cultural, and economic background of the community.

B. ADMINISTRATION

The primary responsibility for the initiation of bilingual education programs in a school district lies with the school board and the superintendent. Once the program has been initiated, a well informed school administrator who sincerely believes in bilingual education will be needed as the catalyst behind a successful bilingual program.

C. STAFF AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Teachers

The single most important factor in the success of a bilingual program is the teacher. Regardless of its design or its administrative support, a program is doomed to failure if the teacher does not function well. It should be strongly emphasized that a teacher is not prepared to teach in a bilingual program merely because he or she is proficient in the native tongue of the student or has received bilingual education training. The teacher must reflect the culture of the student and be able to relate it to course content and methodology. Careful selection, placement, and supervision of teachers in a bilingual program are therefore major considerations.

Teacher Aides

While properly trained bilingual instructional aides are helpful and desirable, they should complement, but never supplant, the bilingual teacher.

Other Personnel

The effectiveness of bilingual education is augmented by the additional services of personnel in areas such as curriculum development, program coordination, material selection and development, and research and evaluation.

Staff Development

1. Teachers in bilingual programs, like any other certified personnel, should have the qualifications required by school districts and state certification policies.

2. Bilingual personnel adequately trained in bilingual instructional theory and methods should be the responsibility of the teacher training institutions.

3. Bilingual education should be an integral part of the quality training received by teachers specializing in this area at teacher training institutions. These training institutions must assume responsibility for initiating and developing curricula in bilingual education training at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Furthermore, the people responsible for preparing teachers in the field of bilingual education should themselves possess expertise in bilingual education and related instructional techniques. They also should themselves be bilingual-bicultural. It follows that teachers thus prepared would possess proficiency in bilingual education regardless of the curricular areas in which they have chosen to specialize.

4. Cultural and historical awareness and sensitivity to Mexican American students should be acquired by the bilingual education teacher before graduation from teacher training institutions and other institutions of higher learning.

5. In-service training in bilingual education of practicing teachers is helpful, but only as a supplement to a structured teacher training program in colleges and universities.

6. One important criteria for hiring bilingual education teacher aides should be their knowledge of the mother tongue and the cultural environment of the students. Already there are teacher aides possessing these qualifications who have the potential to become full-fledged bilingual education teachers. Therefore, an ongoing "career ladder plan" should be instituted which would encourage them to continue their preparation through a bachelor's degree in bilingual education.

7. Teacher aides should receive their practical training in a planned program which encompasses college classroom instruction coordinated with practical classroom experience under the supervision of a bilingual education teacher. College credit would be awarded.

8. Special certification from the state level for teachers with speciality in bilingual education training must become a reality within the near future.

D. MATERIALS

1. In addition to English language materials, realistic and adequate means for acquiring Spanish language materials must be made available for the bilingual education program to be effective.

2. Local production of bilingual materials should be given close consideration in order that instructional materials reflect the culture of the Mexican American child.

3. Materials in Spanish should be incorporated into the list of state-adopted curricular materials.

E. FINANCES

1. Bilingual education would necessarily cost more when initially instituted due to the additional investment in materials and the preparation of teachers. However, the costs of these additional resources would be tempered by the fact that bilingual education can be applied to most existing curricula. In addition, some of the need for trained personnel and bilingual teaching materials can be met through use of existing resources.

2. Bilingual education programs should not be dependent solely on

federal funds for operation and expansion. A school district receiving outside funds should allow allocations to the bilingual program from its inception so that the program can continue in the event federal funds are terminated.

3. It should be the responsibility of the local school district to allocate funds that will serve the special needs of all its students. School districts therefore must provide a curriculum that is compatible with and relevant to the special educational needs of Mexican Americans.

4. Current allocation of monies for education programs serving the needs of Mexican American students (such as FLES, ESL, compensatory education etc.) should not imply that bilingual education is not needed. These programs should be viewed as performing supplementary functions within a comprehensive bilingual program.

E. EVALUATION

1. Achievement, aptitude and intelligence tests currently in use are developed for and standardized from an English-speaking population. Therefore, Mexican American students, who possess different values and who speak a different language, usually receive lower scores than their Anglo peers. These lower scores have served to categorize Mexican Americans as slow and mentally retarded.

2. Tests administered to Mexican American children must reflect the objectives of programs designed to meet their special needs. Particularly at the beginning of their education, the achievement of children in bilingual programs should not be judged against monolingual norms.

3. Tests must be designed especially to gauge the progress of Mexican American students in Spanish as well as English. The unique cultural features of the Spanish-speaking population should be included in these normed and standardized tests. Mere translations of existing tests into Spanish retain their inherent cultural bias.

POSTSCRIPT

We have briefly examined the history, the philosophy, and the need for bilingual education. We also have touched on what we feel are the basic components necessary to implement a successful bilingual program.

We have looked at the tremendous need to solve the educational problems of Mexican Americans in a land where success is predicated on the use of English; where the Mexican American must live in two different worlds; and where whole generations of children have been condemned to lives of poverty and despair by our monolingual, monocultural school system.

To a large extent the federal government has been the instrument which, like the surgeon's knife, has begun to cut through the indifference, neglect, apathy, misconceptions, and unrealistic expectations that have been too long part of the educational history of Mexican Americans. Legal decisions such as Lau v. Nichols also have had a tremendous impact on the cause of bilingual education.

Though many of the bilingual programs are struggling with problems of inadequate funds, personnel resources, and materials and methodologies, there have been enough successes for us to be optimistic.

Thus we feel it is now time for local communities and school districts to fully respond to the educational needs of children who have been denied their fundamental right to an equal educational opportunity because their mother tongue is not English.

We believe that bilingual education will give these children their deserved educational equality leading to the fullest development of their individual potential. The start made possible by a few pioneers and the "Bilingual Education Act of 1968" must now be extended to their full realization unless another generation is to be lost.

As Dr. Jose A. Cardenas stated so well at an AAMAE conference several years ago, "The sowing of the seed has been accomplished. Let us now begin to cultivate the crops so that tomorrow we can harvest the fruit."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANDERSON, THEODORE and MILDRED BOYER eds. BILINGUAL SCHOOLING IN THE UNITED STATES. 2 vols. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1970.

DODSON, CHARLES JOSEPH. THE BILINGUAL METHOD: ANOTHER APPROACH TO THE LEARNING OF MODERN LANGUAGES. Aberystwyth, Faculty of Education, University College of Wales 1962.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. "Bilingualism, Intelligence, and Language Learning," MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL, XLIX, (1965a), 227-237.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. "Varieties of Ethnicity and Language Consciousness," MONOGRAPH SERIES ON LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS, Georgetown University, XVIII, (1965b), pp. 69-79.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. "She Speaks What Language to Whom and When?" LINGUISTICS, II, (1965c), pp. 67-88.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. "Language Maintenance and Language Shift: The American Immigrant Case Within a General Theoretical Perspective," SOCIOLOGUS, XVI, (1965b), pp. 19-38.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. LANGUAGE LOYALTY IN THE UNITED STATES. The Hague: Mouton Press, 1966.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. THE MEASUREMENT AND DESCRIPTION IN BILINGUALS, A FINAL REPORT - PHASE I. New York: Yeshiva University, 1967.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA (dir.). BILINGUALISM IN THE BARRIO. Final Report on Contract OEC - 1-7-0297 to DHEW - Yeshiva University, New York, 1968a.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. READING IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF LANGUAGE. The Hague: Mouton Press, 1968a.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA. "Sociolinguistics Perspective on the Study of Bilingualism," LINGUISTICS, XXXIX, (1968c), pp. 21-50.

GALARZA, ERNESTO and HERMAN GALLEGOS and JULIAN SAMORA. MEXICAN-AMERICANS IN THE SOUTHWEST. Santa Barbara, California: McNally and Loftin, Publishers, 1969, 1970.

THE INVISIBLE MINORITY. Report of the NEA-Tucson survey on the teaching of Spanish to the Spanish-speaking. Washington, D.C.: NEA, Department of Rural Education, 1966.

LAMBERT, W.E., M. JUST and N. SEGALOMITZ. Some Cognitive Consequences of Following the Curricula of the Early School Grades in a Foreign Language, in "Bilingualism and Language Contact: Anthropological, Linguistic, Psychological and Social Aspects, GEORGETOWN MONOGRAPH SERIES ON LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS, No. 23, J. E. Alatis, ed. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN. Testimony presented to the Cabinet Committee Hearings on Mexican American Affairs. El Paso, Texas, October 26-28, 1967. Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American Affairs, Washington, D.C.

MODIANO, NANCY. A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TWO APPROACHES TO THE TEACHING AND READING IN THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE. New York: University of New York, 1966.

PEAL, E. and WALLACE LAMBERT. 1962. "The relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence," PSYCHOLOGICAL MONOGRAPHS: GENERAL AND APPLIED, LXXVI, 27:1-23.

POBLANO, RALPH. GHOSTS IN THE BARRIO. Issues in Bilingual-Bicultural Education. San Rafael, California: Leswing Press, 1973.

SAVILLE, MURIELLE and RUDOLPH TROIKE. A HANDBOOK OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION. Revised edition. TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages), Washington, D.C., 1971.

SERRANO, RODOLFO GAITAN. SOCIOCULTURAL INFLUENCES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF MEXICAN AMERICAN LANGUAGE STYLES. 1972. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona.

STOCKWELL, ROBERT P. and J. DONALD BOWEN. THE SOUNDS OF ENGLISH AND SPANISH . Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

STOCKWELL, ROBERT P., J. DONALD BOWEN and JOSH W. MARTIN. THE GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES OF ENGLISH AND SPANISH. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

TURNER, PAUL R. BILINGUALISM IN THE SOUTHWEST. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 1973.

ULIBARRI, HORACIO. INTERPRETIVE STUDIES OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION. Albuquerque, N.M.: University of New Mexico, 1969.

UNESCO. THE USE OF THE VERNACULAR LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION. (Monographs on Fundamental Education,#8) United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris, 1953.

VALENCIA, ATILANO A. BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL EDUCATION: A PERSPECTIVE IN MULTICULTURAL AMERICA. Albuquerque, N.M.: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1969.

ZAMORA, JULIAN (ed.) LA PAZA - FORGOTTEN AMERICAN. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.

A.A.M.A.E. MEMBERS WITH EXPERTISE IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Mr. James Fisher
Principal, Roberts
Elementary School
47 N. Davila Circle
Tucson, Arizona

Mrs. Rosita Cota
Title VII Bilingual Program
Coordinator
Tucson District #1
1010 E. 10th St.
Tucson, Arizona

Mrs. Arminda Fuentevilla
Title I Bilingual Consultant
Tucson District #1
8342 E. Colette
Tucson, Arizona

Mr. Edward Madrid
Principal, Van Buskirk
Elementary School
725 E. Fair St.
Tucson, Arizona

Mr Dave Kennon
Administrative Assistant to
Superintendent in Charge of
Compliance Activities
Tucson District #1
Tucson, Arizona

Mr. Adalberto Guerrero
University of Arizona
Old Main Building
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Mr. Henry Oyama
Pima College Bilingual Program
Director
Pima Community College
Tucson, Arizona

Dr. Macario Saldate
University of Arizona
College of Education
Tucson, Arizona

Mr. Eugene Benton
Curriculum Helping Teacher
Tucson District #1
Roskruge Area A
Tucson, Arizona

Mr. Ernest Fimbres
Principal
Drachman Elementary School
549 S. Convent Ave.
Tucson, Arizona

REPORTS OF THE MEXICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION STUDY BY
THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Southwest. Report I. 1971. 110 pp. Documents the separation of Mexican American students in schools and school districts throughout the Southwest and the under-representation of Mexican Americans among school personnel.

The Unfinished Education. Report II. 1971. 107 pp. Examines the failure of schools to educate Mexican American students as measured by reading achievement, school dropouts, grade repetition, etc.

The Excluded Student. Report III. 1972. 89 pp. Reports on the denial of equal educational opportunity to Mexican American students as shown by the exclusion from the schools of Mexican American language, culture, and community participation.

Mexican American Education in Texas: A Function of Wealth. Report IV. 1972. 53 pp. Examines the ways the Texas school finance system works to the detriment of districts in which Mexican American students are concentrated.

Teachers and Students: Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students. Report V. 1973. 68 pp. Describes how teachers neglect Mexican American students in favor of Anglo students in the course of daily teaching.

Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans. Report VI. 1974. 98 pp. Focuses on specific problems in the education of Mexican American children and recommends actions at various governmental and educational levels which may lead to solutions of these problems.

Para los Niños. For the Children: Improving Education for Mexican Americans. Clearinghouse Publication 47. October, 1974. 27 pp.

Bilingual/Bicultural Education. A Privilege or A Right? A report of the Illinois State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Prepared for the information and consideration of the commission. May, 1974.

These documents may be obtained from:

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
Mountain States Regional Office
1726 Champa Street
222 Ross Building
Denver, Colorado 80202